(2) The scheme was meant for the benefit of the villages and should therefore rest on a voluntary basis and as the people began more and more to realise the advantages from the scheme there would be less difficulty in inducing the people to submit themselves to such regulation.

To know the sense of the assembly the President put to vote the question whether a Regulation might be enacted giving the power to levy cess when three-fourths of the adult males in a village consented to it.

Ninety-five members voted for the measure and seventy-seven against it.

Reply of Government.—As the opinion of a large body is against the measure, no action will be taken by Government regarding the introduction of a Regulation for the present.

SUBJECT No. 44.

Sanitary Inspectors and the Village Improvement Scheme.

Messrs. Krishnamurtiachar, Mulbagal taluk, and Gurumurtisetti, Mulbagal Municipality.

Summary of discussion.—As works to be done under the Village Improvement Scheme are more or less of a sanitary nature, they may be entrusted to the Sanitary Inspectors.

Reply of Government.—Existing rules are sufficient.

SUBJECT No. 45.

Revival of para 29 of Rule XX of the old Revenue Rules of 1890.

Mr. B. Sreenivasa Iyengar, Anekal taluk.

Summary of discussion.—Para 29 of Rule XX of the old Revenue Rules of 1890 (*viz.*, when the possession of a land has once been given, it should not be disturbed without the sanction of Government) may be revived.

Reply of Government.—Under consideration.

SUBJECT No. 46.

Retention of the revenue and the civil court records in the court adjudicating a claim or passing an order, until the lapse of the time allowed for appeal.

Messrs. B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Anekal taluk, Adinaraniah, Chandrasekharaiya, Devasettappa, Dodballapur taluk, and Gurusambhulingappa, Dodballapur Municipality.

Summary of discussion.—The records of the cases in revenue and civil courts may be ordered to be retained in the courts passing an order or adjudicating a claim till the time allowed for the presentation of an appeal is over.

Mr. G. Channakeshavaiya of Chitaldrug spoke advocating the proposal.

Reply of Government.—Will be considered.

SUBJECT No. 47.

Rights of *Anubhavadars*.

Mr. Subba Rão, Kolar District Board.

Summary of discussion.—*Anubhavadars* are the persons really entitled to pay *kandayam* to Government though the *khate* may not be in their names. But, at present, if the khatedar pays *kandayam* though the *khate* land is not in his enjoyment the same will be received and given credit to in the accounts. Orders may be passed directing the receipt of *kandayam* from the *anubhavadars* only in preference to the nominal *khatedars*.

Mr. C. Srinivasa Rao opposed the proposal.

Reply of Government.—Not possible.

SUBJECT No. 48.

Conversion of Amrut Mahal kavals into large landed estates.

Mr. K. Ramandjiengar, Gubbi taluk

Summary of discussion.—Large landed estates can be successfully maintained by enterprising people only in places where there is an abundant supply of water. There are many Amrut Mahal kavals with large tanks in them,

which are highly suitable for cultivation. A comparison of the number of cattle of the Amrut Mahal Department and the lands under its control will show that it could conveniently spare many kavals for cultivation. Such kavals as have good water-supply may be divided into blocks of 100 or 150 acres forming large estates and given over to persons applying for them.

There was very strong opinion in favour of a good portion of lands belonging to the Amrut Mahal kavals being made available for cultivation. It was represented that the total area of the Amrut Mahal kavals was nearly 300,000 acres while the number of head of cattle was about 8,000. The present area was set apart when the herds were much larger and it was therefore capable of reduction. Tank beds, irrigable and valuable lands were often included in Amrut Mahal kavals which, if sold to the raiyats, would fetch a very high price.

Mr. Dasappa of Arsikere complained of the great delay in the disposal of darkhasts for Amrut Mahal kaval lands. He cited the instance of the Hebbanghatta Besike kaval near Arsikere.

Mr. Karnick Krishnamurti Rao also complained that the raiyats had repeatedly applied for the Sankeghatta kaval and he was prepared to deposit Rs. 10,000, if it was given to him.

Messrs. H. V. Rangaswami, Karnick Krishnamurti Rao, C. Vasudeva Rao and two or three others referred to the perquisites levied by *Servegars*, and stated that the *Servegars* made great profit by selling the grass to the raiyats. It would be advantageous to Government to sell the grass by auction.

Mr. C. Vasudeva Rao also suggested that the area of the kavals might be reduced by setting apart only twice or three times the land usually required for each head of cattle and the rest made available for cultivation.

The Amrut Mahal Superintendent was not in favour of the proposals.

Reply of Government.—The subject will be fully enquired into.

SUBJECT NO. 49.

Sale of lands for arrears of land revenue.

Messrs. Adinaranaiya, Chandrasekharaiya, Deva Settappa, Dodballapur taluk, and Gurusambhulingappa, Dodballapur Municipality.

Summary of discussion.—For the recovery of arrears of land revenue, coercive processes are being taken on all the survey numbers included in the *khate*, though there may be many *hissedars*. The lands of the persons from whom the arrears are due may be proceeded against in the first instance.

Reply of Government.—Noted.

Note.—The members were asked to submit a note of representation separately to Government.